



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

completely cuts the ground from under the presumption that Recha, in spite of her own eyesight, could ever have believed, as the play represents in the opening scene, that she was rescued by an angel.

JOHN PRESTON HOSKINS.

Princeton University.

LAZARILLO DE TORMES

Restitucion del texto primitivo d'la Uida de Lazarillo de Tormes e de sus fortunas e aduersidades, impresso al estilo de la epoca. Seguido d'la segunda parte escrita por Luna interprete d'lengua española en Paris. Edicion dirigida e revisada por EUDALDO CANIBELL. Barcelona, Tipografia La Academica, 1906. 8vo., vi, lxxiv fols.

La Vida de Lazarillo de Tormes. Strasburgo, Heitz [1913]. 16mo., 70 pp. (Bibliotheca Romanica 177.)

La Vida de Lazarillo de Tormes. . . . Edición y notas de JULIO CEJADOR Y FRAUCA. Madrid, Ediciones de "La Lectura," 1914. 12mo., 280 pp.

These three editions of a classic come to us, each with its distinct claim to notice. The first because of the promise of its title, the second because of the general excellence of the series in which it is included, and the third because of its scholarly editor. They invite comparison.

After the admirable *Restitución de la edición príncipe* of the *Lazarillo* given us by Foulché-Delbosc in 1900, an editor would scarcely be expected to advertise his text by calling it a *Restitución del texto primitivo*, unless he had found the long-lost princeps, or had evidence to justify him in utilizing in a new way the variants of the early editions already known to us. Sr. Canibell uses the edition of 1900 as the "médula" of his own, "con algunas variantes de importancia exigua,"

and inserts in their respective places in the body of the text, the additions of Alcalá 1554 which Foulché-Delbosc has seen fit to relegate to an appendix. Sr. Canibell gives no hint as to the source of the readings of his text which are not found in the edition of 1900. Let us examine a few of them, bearing in mind that the readings of FD are constant in all three texts of 1554.

FD 4, 11, *leños a que*; C *leña con que*.—FD 3, 14, *justicia*; C *justizia*.—FD 3, 22, *metiose*; C *metiosse*.—FD 4, 26, *sauanas*; C *sabanas*.—FD 5, 21, *yo seria para adestralle*; C *seria a proposito para adestralle*.—FD 5, 23, *por ensalgar la fe auia muerto en la de los Gelves*; C *por ensalzar la fe hauiá muerto en la batalla de los Gelues*.—FD 9, 5, *por cabo*; C *por el cabo*.—FD 9, 10, *turome*; C *durome*.—FD 9, 12, *lo tenia*; C *le tenia*.—FD 9, 13, *a si como*; C *a si el hierro como*.—FD 11, 22, *estendia*; C *extendia*.—FD 12, 1, *San Juan*; C *San Juan*.—FD 12, 28, *note mucho*; C [*mucho*].—FD 13, 4, *en vn meson*; C [].—FD 13, 20, *bueltas*; C *vueltas*.—FD 13, 24, *al qual*; C *el qual*.—FD 14, 1, *ay*; C *ahy*.—FD 71, 2, *rostriguemados*; C *rostrillos quemados*.

Since in all these cases the reading of FD needs no emendation and probably represents the princeps, it is impossible to condone the capricious readings of C. The text is apparently quite unauthoritative throughout, and less admirable indeed than the current unpretentious modernizations.

While the brief introduction presents no new facts, it offers for consideration a new theory of authorship. Sr. Canibell inclines to the belief that Fray Juan de Ortega was the author, and that the work is at the same time an autobiography. This blend of two hypotheses would be more difficult of proof than either of its parts, neither of which has much to recommend it. If we consider the *Lazarillo* an autobiography it is hard to explain away its folkloristic elements, and the ascription to Ortega rests on the flimsiest of hearsay evidence. Moreover, the editor is inconsistent in attributing to Ortega, a cleric esteemed for his learning, a work which he elsewhere declares to be written "con sobriedad y llaneza muy propias de quien poco ó nada ha frecuentado el aula de retórica, pero inusitada (sic!) en un escritor

castellano familiarizado con el trato de las musas." (Fol. 4, recto.)

It is a pleasure to record that from a mechanical and artistic standpoint the Barcelona edition leaves nothing to be desired. It is beautifully printed in black-letter on antique paper, rubricated, signed and foliated, and is a credit to the editor and printer, who have spared no pains to give a worthy setting to a literary jewel.¹

It is difficult to know how to treat the edition of the *Bibliotheca Romanica*. On the one hand to criticize an edition which costs only ten cents is to look a gift horse in the mouth. On the other, it would have been as easy to print a good text as the one given us. The fact is this text is not just what it claims to be. The editor, Sr. L. Sorrento, writes: "La médula de nuestro texto es la edición que ha sido publicada por R. Foulché-Delbosc . . . con algunas variantes. Hemos insertado las adiciones de la edición de Alcalá 1554 . . . y tenido cuenta de la edición de Burgos 1554."² Sr. Canibell's edition is not mentioned, even in the bibliography (p. 12), but there can be no doubt that it has been followed closely. All the capricious readings given above are found also in Sr. Sorrento's text, and such cases as the following point in the same direction:

FD 5, 12, *esforço*; C *efforço*; S *efforço*.—FD 4, 8, *auiale miedo*; C *hauiale miedo*; S *haviale miedo* (S regularly uses *v* for *u*).—FD 13, 10, *cabe el fuego*; C *caue el fuego*; S *cave el fuego*.

While the text is a contradiction and a mosaic, the introduction is so well done as to cause one to wonder how the two parts can be by the same hand. The editor's non-committal attitude regarding the moot question of authorship is the only reasonable one in the present

state of our knowledge. The bibliography is unsatisfactory not so much for its incompleteness, as for the failure to distinguish between editions of the first part, the expurgated text and the revision of Luna.³

Turning now to the latest *Lazarillo*, let it be stated once for all that Sr. Cejador, to whom we already owed our only Cervantes dictionary and most valuable annotated editions of the *Celestina* and the *Libro de buen amor*, has placed us further in his debt by his admirable contribution to the literature of the first picaresque novel. An annotated edition has long been imperatively needed, and we now have one which it will be difficult to improve upon. Not only has the editor provided a commentary valuable to the lay reader, but he has cleared up some passages which, to judge by the stumbling of the translators, have presented difficulty to the competent.

The text is a fairly accurate reproduction of Burgos 1554, based apparently upon Foulché-Delbosc's edition. The editor gives as his reason for following Burgos, that he considers it in lieu of the princeps. He disregards, consequently, without disproving, the arguments of the scholar who must be considered our highest authority in the matter.⁴ The additions of Alcalá are inserted where they belong.

The introduction is chiefly interesting for the discussion of authorship. One by one the suggested hypotheses are gone over, and their points fairly presented. Sr. Cejador is not afraid of them, so confident is he in the merit of his own candidate. At length, and with abundance of detail, he puts forward the claims of Sebastián de Horozco, founding his belief on parallels of subject-matter, spirit and language, between the Toledan writer's works (chiefly the *Cancionero*) and the *Lazarillo*. It

¹In his list of artistic editions of *Lazarillo*, Sr. Canibell does not mention that of Madrid 1844-45, printed by Omar y Soler, containing all three parts and admirably illustrated with woodcuts.

²This last phrase is obscure considering that the edition of Foulché-Delbosc gives the variants of Burgos. There is no intimation that one of the two copies of Burgos 1554, long in private possession in England, has been used to correct Foulché-Delbosc.

³The edition of Madrid 1563 surely never existed. Paris 1838 is in Portuguese. The editor describes for the first time the edition of Lerida 1612.

⁴Foulché-Delbosc, *Remarques sur Lazarillo de Tormes. Revue Hispanique*, VII (1900), 81-97. Sr. Cejador assumes that the oldest edition is the best. In the case of a lost princeps this is not necessarily true.

is only fair to an earlier critic to mention that Sr. Asensi had already suggested Horozco, though timidly, perhaps, in his introduction to the *Cancionero*. In his words: "Cierta analogía encontramos entre el diálogo y frases de Sebastián de Horozco y los del Lazarillo de Tormes, que nos hacen sospechar pudiera ser la novela obra de aquel. . . ." (p. 158.) This is not the place to take up Sr. Cejador's arguments in detail. One may hesitate about accepting them so long as there is any other way of explaining the analogies, and there are at least three possibilities. *Lazarillo* may have imitated Horozco, Horozco may have imitated the *Lazarillo*,⁵ or it may be a case of two Tole-
dan authors who are handling independently but in more or less the same spirit and language, the same traditional material. Before choosing between four possibilities we should know when the *Lazarillo* was written, and more about Horozco than we do at present. Withal, and despite certain inconsistencies, Sr. Cejador's candidate is the ablest presented so far.

As intimated above, it is in the notes that Sr. Cejador is seen at his best. He is discriminating and scholarly, and the task of commentator is one for which his wide reading and linguistic knowledge peculiarly fit him. May he continue to illumine the dark places of the older classics!

It is the writer's opinion that a text as important as the *Lazarillo* is deserving of the fullest possible illustration, and from this belief, and from no spirit of meticulous criticism, spring the following observations.

Page 69, note. Here as elsewhere, often, the titles of little-known books are too concisely given. A matter of great importance to us working in America.—71, 2. The quotation from Pliny is also in F. de Valles, *Cartas familiares*, Madr. 1603 (Gallardo, *Ensayo*, IV, col. 90) and Rojas, *Viaje*, ed. Cañete, I, p. 36.—72, 10. Cf. Silva, *Seg. Celest.*, Madr., 1874, p. 277: "Porque creeme, Poncia, que pocos habria que con fuerza aventurasen las vidas, si pensasen que solos ellos habian de ser testigos de la gloria de sus hazañas."—74, 1. "no mire

Vuestra Magestad el ruin estilo con que va escrito," Villalon, *Viaje de Turquía*, p. 2a; "sola la voluntad de mi baxo estilo . . . resciaua Vuestra Magestad," *id.*, p. 3a; "cortar con el mal amolado cuchillo la neuma de mi torpe pluma para dirigirle," Timoneda's *Epistola* to Rueda's *Comedias*, ed. Acad., p. 2.—86, 4. The explanation given for *pringar* does not apply here, as the negro is evidently not executed. See the word in Covarrubias and connect his comment with *pobre esclauo*, p. 85, 7.—88, 2. "para ser en tierna edad Otra niña de Gelves," Castillo, *Niña de los embustes*, Madr., 1906, p. 232.—89, 14. Covarrubias, p. 191a, has a good note on the *Toro de la puente de Salamanca*.—90, 4. (Cf. 164, 8). Sr. Cejador does not discuss the traditional character given the *mozo de ciego* in these passages. Yet it is important for the question of sources.—98, 1. So the blind beggar in Timoneda's *Paso de los ciegos*: "Devotos cristianos, ¿quien Manda rezar Una oracion singular Nueva de nuestra Señora?" and "Mandadme rezar, pues que es Noche santa," etc. Moratin, *Orígenes*, p. 289 (*Bib. de Aut. Esp.*, t. II).—104, 6. An allusion to one of the best-known *exempla*.—108, 18. "Más me precio, hija . . . de una oracion del Conde 6 de la Emparedada: esto te podré amostrar; mi amor, si lo quieres aprender." *Seg. Celest.*, p. 218.—111, 2. "Entre estos dos cortezones pringada estaba mi bien, como torrezno en mendrugos que no se pueden morder." Quevedo, *Obras*, Madr., 1794, VIII, 345.—118, 4. This passage should not be connected with the additions of Alcalá, but with the passage in the last *Tratado*, p. 256, 12, "tengo cargo de pregonar los vinos," etc., and p. 258, 1 ff.—121, 14. There are several more versions than those noted here. A detailed study of them will appear soon.—123, 2. Another possibility is *oler* imperative from *oler*, which has better sense here. This is the suggestion of M. Foulché-Delbosc in a letter to my friend Louis How, whose translation of the *Lazarillo* will shortly appear.—127, ll. 2, 3, 4. It would have been interesting to note such passages as this, which the Inquisition cut out of the *Laz. Castigado*. The same idea was expressed by Alcalá Yañez in a way which causes

⁵ Morel-Fatio et Rouanet, *Le théâtre espagnol*, Paris, 1900, p. 11.

us to suspect a tradition regarding clergymen. "Era mi buen clérigo algo allegador y amigo de andar por el modo ahorrativo, natural condición de clérigos, y más si son viejos . . ." *Donado Hablador*, Cap. I.—130, 4. Neither of the examples is as close a parallel as that from Delicado, *Lozana Andaluza*, Mam., XXXIV: "¿por dineros venis? pues ¡tan blanco el ojo! ¡camínal!"—130, 7. An excellent note on *duelos y quebrantos*, when Rodríguez Marín had apparently said the last word (*D. Q. t. I*, p. 50). It should be noted that there is a connection between the eating of *menudos* on Saturday and the fact that this was the regular day for slaughtering. Cf. the poem addressed to a *tripera* (!) in Paz, *Sales esp.*, II, 257: "Oy es sábado y ternéis, mi alma, mucho en que entender."—133, 3. "assi como llamamos tan bien triumphar, por via de burla el beuer y comer y regosijarse," Gracian, *Galateo*, Cap. nono. "Al compás que lo pasaban mal los soldados triunfábamos nosotros," *Estebanillo*, Cap. V.—135, 10, *cofradrias y mortuorios*. Sr. Cejador includes these words among the rare expressions common to *Laz.* and Horozco. They are in the *Celestina*, ed. Cejador, I, 68. Cf. also "aquellas comidas . . . que se dan en los mortuorios," *Crotalón*, p. 143 (Menéndez, *Orígenes*, t. II).—136, 2. The editor questions whether the phrase *beber más que un saludador* refers to the drunkenness of these characters. See this from *Estebanillo*, Cap. VI: "se persuadiese á que no había cocinero que no fuese ladrón, saludador que no fuese borracho, ni músico que no fuese gallina." Quevedo has much to say about them in the *Sueño de las Calaveras* (*Obras*, Madr., 1791, t. I, 86 ff).—137, 7. *le lleuasse* and the whole context argue that the reading of Alcalá, *le echasse*, is the correct one.—140, 14. Read *arcaz*. *Arte* in the sense of *hechura* hardly fits the context. *Laz. Castigado* reads *de esta arca*, which indicates that its editors did not have Alcalá before them and were probably correcting Burgos or Antwerp.—141, 5. "pesandole y poniendole sobre su cabeza . . . Lo mismo hazen si topan vn bocado de pan, diciendo que es la cara de Dios," Villalón, *Viaje de Turquía*, 106b. There is a close parallel in *Pícara Justina*, ed.

Puyol, p. 102 and note in t. III, 136. The *Santo Oficio* changed this passage to "veo cantidad de panes dentro," and inconsistently let stand the similar references on pp. 145 and 146.—143, 5. The note does not explain the passage. Cf. "tenemos algunas frasis, aunque de la gente comun, y vulgar, como ciegame Santanton, al que va a hazer alguna cosa mala, deseando que aunque tope con lo que va a buscar no lo vea." Covarrubias, s.v. *cegar*.—147, 10. "Si tenéis criados, ¿para qué os sirven? Para que no os dejen cosa a vida. . . ." *Col. de Entremeses*, ed. Cotarelo, t. I, 148a.—149, 3. B reads *cierrasse* according to FD 25, 8, and Butler Clarke's reprint, Lond., 1897, p. 36.—151, 18. *los cuydados del rey de Francia* may be another form of the locution *Esos cuidados matan al rey*, Correas, 134b. Might not there be an allusion to the trouble of Francis I in 1525?—154, 2. "Armamos a los paxaros, a los conejos, a las gorras . . .," Covarrubias, s.v. *armar*. Apparently not as rare as the editor thinks.—169, 10. The description of the entrance is deliberate preparation for the folk tale used later, and evidence of the artistic character of the work.—170, 10, *para en camara*. "No sois vos para en camara Pedro. No sois vos para en camara non, Sino para en camaranchon," Covarrubias, s.v. *camara*.—171, 5. B reads *aunque* (Clarke and FD).—176, 1. One difficulty with this passage is that editors, old and new, have felt that it was the *ropa* and not the *colchón* that was dirty. If we assume a misprint *continuada* for *continuado* in the princeps, and emend, the whole passage becomes clear.—179, 1. The translators have had trouble with this place. Morel-Fatio reads "et moi-même qui lui servait de portemanteau"; Lauser, "und ich bediente ihn dabei-aufmerksam"; Markham finds it easier to omit. The following is confirmatory of Sr. Cejador's explanation: "Tambien los confesores servis algunas vezes de pelillo y andais a sabor de paladar con ellos, por no los desabrir", Villalón, *Viaje de Turquía*, 26b.—181, 5. The editor accepts Morel-Fatio's contention that there was no Conde de Arcos between 1483 and 1617, and that the allusion is to the Conde Claros of the ballads. How then

shall we explain the following? "Treviños, Ciudad-Real, Rota, del conde de Arcos, Adonde bate el mar." *Rom. gen.*, no. 1150, *Convocatoria á la cristianidad para la guerra contra los Turcos*. This ballad is from the *Canc. de Romances* and written after 1534. Agustín de Rojas in the *Viaje entret.* I, 297 (Madr. 1901, reprint of 1604), speaking of the Toledo of his day, says: "Pues sin esto, tiene esta ciudad otra grandeza, no menor que las que hemos dicho, y es que en el reino de Toledo tienen sus estados muchos señores de las casas más antiguas y más calificadas de España, como son: el marqués de Villena y duque de Escalona; el duque de Maqueda, marqués de Montemayor, conde de Orgaz, conde de Fuen-salida, conde de Casarrubios, conde de Arcos" . . . The writer is inclined to believe that the author of the *Lazarillo* made a natural allusion to a local magnate, and whimsically added the line from the ballad of Conde Claros, which may have been suggested to his mind by the similarity of the names. The Alcalá reading would be a correction.—184, 5. "Y tiene un campo llano, que se llama la Vega, la cual es muy apacible, y donde salen á recrearse las ninfas deste lugar en todos tiempos, porque en invierno tiene sol y en verano frescura", Rojas, *Viaje*, ed. cit. I, 296.—195, 2. "Cabeça de lobo, l'occasion que quelqu'un prend pour faire son profit, comme celui qui ayant tué un loup, en porte la teste par les villages, afin qu'on lui donne quelque chose, pour avoir deliuré la contree d'un animal pernicieux et dommageable", Oudin, *Tesoro de las dos lenguas*, Paris, 1621; "creo que en son de hazer cabeças de virgenes, podran hazer otras tantas de lobo", *Pícara Justina*, ed. Puyol, II, 143; Puyol's note (III, 133) gives the explanation from Correas, and adds an example from *Comedia Evfrosina*. Cf. "agredézcalo, hijo, él á tí, que por mi vida que ganó contigo anoche

como con cabeza de lobo", *Seg. Celest.* 207; "con su perigrinaje ganaba como con cabeza de lobo," Villalón, *Viaje de Turquía* 13a. "No hera mala cabeza de lobo la gera pliega, que no costaria toda vn escudo," *id.*, 44a. "cabeças de lobos, con que piden," *Commedia Evfros.*, 90a.—199, 2. B reads *cornada*.—205, 11. "Vive en casa lóbrega, de Lazarillo de Tormes. (Para decir desaliñada.)," Correas, 587a; "lobrego y lobregura por triste y tristeza son vocablos muy vulgares, no se usan entre gente de corte", Valdés, *Dial. leng.*, ed. Boehmer, p. 387, 19. These citations prove sufficiently the popular character of the episode.—211, 13. Read *bien criado*. The following is copied by Gallardo (t. III, col. 83) from a text of 1532: "Hablarlas has, segun el merecimiento de cada uno, quitandole el bonete, y haciendole reverencia, si tal fuere la persona: y dirasle: Beso las manos de Vuestra Merced, ó mantenga Dios á Vuestra Merced, ó mantengaos Dios, si tanto no fuere."—244, 6. The reading of B is probably the correct one, and offers no difficulty if we take *las mas* to refer to *vezes*.—214, 9. *librar* is a common synonym of *pagar*.—219, 13. Morel-Fatio, *Etudes, Prem. sér.*, 2me ed., p. 122, makes this line refer to a different ballad, no 858 of the *Rom. gen.* It is hardly exact enough to be necessarily an allusion to either.—220, 11. The same suggestion has been made by Morel-Fatio, *op. cit.*, p. 122.—226, 5. A pun on *romper*, 'to wear,' and *romper*, 'to wear out.'—228, 6. A note is desired to *peras verdinales*.—229, 1. B reads *sabian*.—229, 19. B reads *el pueblo*.—254, 9. Note desired for *puerta*.—254, 11. *Cuellar* is not here the name of an *espadero*. The town was famed for its swords. See Riaño, *Industrial Arts in Spain*, Lond., 1890, p. 90.—256, 4. Punctuate *prouechosa; y con favor que*.—256, 16. No one seems to have remarked that the *pregonero* is the basest of all officials, after the *verdugo*; an observation essential to the understanding of the crowning irony of the last chapter.—259, 7. One of the most difficult lines in the whole text. Does it mean *de vez en cuando un par de perdices*? This use of *cuando*, and the article after *par de* is not unknown. Cf. "la docena de las perdices, el par de los carneros,

"Nuestro ingenio ó casa de moneda estuvo en la jurisdicción de San Nicolás, en un edificio propio del Conde de Arcos, quien cuidaba de la dirección de la fábrica y nombraba sus oficiales." López de Ayala, *Toledo en el siglo XVI*, Madrid, 1901. (*Discursos leídos ante la Real Acad. de la Hist.*) The author is speaking of the time of Charles the Fifth.

la media docena de los cabritos", Menéndez, *Orígenes*, t. III, p. clxxxii, quoting *Comedia Seraphina*; "Que no verná hombre aquí que no saque dél cuando de la leña, otro el carbón, y otro el vino", Delicado, *Loz. And.*, Mam. XLI.

CHARLES PHILIP WAGNER.

University of Michigan.

La Part de Charles Nodier dans la formation des idées romantiques de Victor Hugo jusqu'à la préface de Cromwell, by EUNICE M. SCHENCK. Paris, Champion, 1914. 8vo., xi + 149 pp. (Bryn Mawr College Monographs, XVI.)

Of Hugo's gift for assimilating the ideas of others, Edouard Rod has said, not too delicately perhaps,¹ but with a degree of truth: "Comme une éponge dans un baquet, Victor Hugo a absorbé tout ce qui l'entourait. . . ." ² This judgment, tempered with a recognition of the poet's supreme achievements in the realm of the imagination,³ represents a view of his intellectual dependence which promises to become definitive. The problem has remained, however, to determine the exact nature of certain of the borrowings, and particular interest has attached to the *Préface de Cromwell*. Souriau, in his excellent critical edition, examined the influences which appear in this document, but failed to deal adequately with the contribution of Nodier. Miss Schenck's chief aim is evidently to fill this gap; while she does not limit herself to the one problem, and treats fully and conclusively of the influence of Nodier upon Hugo's early poetry and fiction, she puts the stress on the connection of their critical writings, and focuses attention on the *Préface*.

After assembling the specific remarks in the *Préface* which recall, and in a few cases absolutely match, declarations of Nodier, supple-

¹ Cf. Souriau, *la Préface de Cromwell*, Paris, 1897, p. 147, note 1.

² *Études sur le XIXe siècle*, Paris, 1888, p. 125.

³ As Rod himself tempers it, especially in his article on Hugo in *Nouvelles études sur le XIXe siècle*, Paris, 1899.

menting and correcting Souriau's investigation of these, Miss Schenck offers an imposing array of quotations from Nodier which, antedating the manifesto, foreshadow its basic ideas (Chapter III). Hugo's indebtedness is clearly demonstrated. Whether Nodier may have actively assisted in drawing up the document is discussed by the writer, and while she refrains, with admirable discretion, from insisting upon this possibility, she disposes effectively of Souriau's hypothesis of the collaboration of Sainte-Beuve.

The results reached in a consideration of "les trois essais de Nodier postérieurs à la Préface" (Chapter IV) are less acceptable. The reference is to three articles published in the *Revue de Paris*, in 1829-30, entitled: "Quelques observations pour servir à l'histoire de la nouvelle école littéraire"; "Des types en littérature"; "Du fantastique en littérature". Miss Schenck, maintaining that these are merely a recapitulation of the ideas of the *Préface*,⁴ furnishes abundant evidence of the somewhat strained relations between Nodier and Hugo, beginning at a period not long after the latter's proclamation was published, and draws the conclusion that Nodier, weary of being exploited, even slightly irritated, had determined to claim his own. The whole argument crumbles unless it can be proved that Hugo is repeated in the three *Essais*. Let us examine Miss Schenck's characterization of these.

They are accessible, she writes, and need not be described at length. Of the first we are asked to recall (p. 113) that "c'est surtout l'idée du dualisme des personnages de Shakespeare que relève l'auteur: mélanges, dit-il, du fantastique et du grotesque". This is a misstatement. While Nodier's article is somewhat discursive, as the title suggests, his initial sentence indicates clearly the main theme: "cet amour passionné qui est le principal élément des compositions de la nouvelle école".⁵ In the body of the article he stresses the significance of *Werther*, and adds approving comment

⁴ Cf. p. ix: "Pourquoi Nodier aura-t-il senti la nécessité d'affirmer ses idées—les idées de la *Préface*—après coup?" Cf. pp. viii, 113.

⁵ *Revue de Paris*, VII, 141.